DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND (DWSRF) LOAN PROGRAM - SFY 2002 FINAL PPL: July 2001 - June 2002

7/1/01 Amended 7/23/01 Costs in (\$1,000)

Project Categories

PPL Rank/Project Name	Total Score/	Population	PWS ID#/		,					MHI	Estimated	Planning/	Total	Cumulative
-	Project Need	Served	LOAN NO.	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>c</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>F</u>	(Real \$\$)	Const. \$\$	Design \$\$	Project	<u>Total</u>
1. MARSHALL	145		5261003											
	PH,C,I	379	DW101172 01			Х	Х		Х	\$19,917	\$400	\$196	\$596	\$596
2. CARTHAGE	130		5270001	.,								.		
	PH,C,I	887		X	Х				Х	\$21,937	\$847	\$147	\$994	\$1,590
3. EAST CHICAGO	120		5245012	.,		.,								.
	PH,I	33892	DW199110 01	X		Х			Х	\$19,391	\$12,400	\$3,700	\$16,100	\$17,690
4. PERRYSVILLE	115	440	5283009	V		V				#07.750	0070	0.470	04.454	040.044
- 1//2 2 2 2 1// 2 1/2 1/2 1/2 1/2 1/2 1/	PH,C,I	443	DW199102 01	X	Х	Х			Х	\$27,750	\$978	\$173	\$1,151	\$18,841
5. WOODBURN	110	4000	5202024	.,						***	0.1 = 0.0	0.440		000 101
	PH,I	1320	DW101178 01	X	Х	Х		1	Х	\$32,841	\$1,500	\$140	\$1,640	\$20,481
6. INGALLS	110		5248012	.,						***		0050	A 0 5 00	***
	PH,I	1014	DW199107 01	X	Х		Х		Х	\$23,409	\$2,330	\$258	\$2,588	\$23,069
7. BEVERLY SHORES	105		N/A						.,					
	PH,I	622	DW101196 01		Х		Х		Х	\$36,094	\$5,571	\$430	\$6,001	\$29,070
8. PINES	105		B)4/40004004							***		0.40=	00.004	
	PH,I	798	DW102210 01				Х			\$28,250	\$2,829	\$195	\$3,024	\$32,094
9. ROYAL CENTER	105		5209008	.,					.,					
	PH,I	871		Х	Х	Х			Х	\$24,297	\$1,590	\$343	\$1,933	\$34,027
10. LOGANSPORT	100		5209006											4
	PH,I	16865	DW101195 01		Х				Х	\$20,533	\$3,970	\$210	\$4,180	\$38,207
11. MEDARYVILLE	90		5266003											
	PH,I	689	DW101180 01		Х				X	\$20,930	\$2,229	\$605	\$2,835	\$41,042
12. WINIMAC	85		5266005											4
	PH,I	2262	DW101197 01	Х	Х	Х			Х	\$25,313	\$650	\$86	\$736	\$41,778
13. LAGRANGE	85		5244003										4	4
		2382	DW101194 01		Х	Х			Х	\$28,000	\$1,722	\$176	\$1,898	\$43,676
14. ROCKVILLE	85		5261006											
		2706	DW101185 01	Х		Х			X	\$17,718	\$2,236	\$462	\$2,698	\$46,374
15 CENTERVILLE	80		5289003											
	l l	2400	DW101182 01	Х	Х	Х		X	Х	\$21,830	\$1,615	\$211	\$1,826	\$48,200
16. PALMYRA	80		5231004											
		3100	DW102206 01		Х	Х			X	\$27,435	\$1,503	\$300	\$1,803	\$50,003
17. NORWOOD RWSD	75		5235004	.,	l									4
	C,I	717	DW101181 01	Х	Х	Х			Х	\$32,023	\$2,080	\$195	\$2,275	\$52,278
18. FINCH-NEWTON	75		5274003		l									
		4170	DW102204 01		Х	Х				\$23,479	\$524	\$128	\$652	\$52,930
19. CLINTON	75		5283004		l									
		5040	DW101183 01		X	X		1	1	\$17,263	\$1,150	\$350	\$1,500	\$54,430

PPL Rank/Project Name	Total Score/	Population	PWS ID#/							MHI	Estimated	Planning/	Total	Cumulative
	Project Need	Served	LOAN NO.	<u>A</u>	В	<u>c</u>	D	E	F	(Real \$\$)		Design \$\$	Project	Total
		' <u></u> '		_	_	_		_	_					
20. BROWN COUNTY	75		5207001											
	C,I	14080	DW100171 01		Χ	Х			X	\$29,425	\$4,889	\$769	\$5,658	\$60,088
21. VINCENNES	75		5242014											
	1	19859	DW101177 01		Χ	Х			X	\$18,829	\$4,506	\$703	\$5,209	\$65,297
22. DANVILLE	70		5232004											
	PH,I	4982	DW100170 01		Χ	Χ			Х	\$33,536	\$1,729	\$242	\$1,971	\$67,268
23. WILLIAMSPORT	70		5286004											
	I	1798			Х	X			X	\$22,288	\$1,211	\$248	\$1,459	\$68,727
24. PAOLI	70		5259004											
	I	3520	DW101198 01	Х	X	Х			Х	\$19,320	\$3,803	\$299	\$4,102	\$72,829
25. ARLINGTON RWSD	65		5235002											
	PH,I	177		Х	Х			X	Х	\$32,675	\$590	\$267	\$857	\$73,686
26. COLUMBUS	55		5203002											
(Garden City)	PH,I	38000	DW100161 01	Χ	X				Х	\$34,500	\$297	\$79	\$376	\$74,062
27. WOLCOTTVILLE	55		5244010											
	PH,I	877	DW101199 01	X	X				Х	\$28,068	\$679	\$65	\$744	\$74,806
28. VALLEY VIEW ESTATES	55									4				
	1	300	DW102207 01		Х		Х			\$17,000	\$185	\$25	\$210	\$75,016
29. SPICELAND	55		5233016											
		867		X	Х	Х			Х	\$26,797	\$2,000	\$275	\$2,275	\$77,291
30. DALE	55		5274002		.,									
		1553			Х	Х				\$27,112	\$657	\$190	\$847	\$78,138
31. GEORGETOWN	55		5222003			.,				***	00.40=	0=10	00.075	004.440
00 BUG 01B00A1	<u> </u>	2092	DW199122 01		Х	Х			Х	\$32,162	\$2,465	\$510	\$2,975	\$81,113
32. PIKE-GIBSON	55		D14440004404			.,				A07.000		0-4	0.10 =	001 = 10
20 44/2 772 44/2		8370	DW102211 01		Х	Х			Х	\$27,936	\$354	\$51	\$405	\$81,518
33. AND TRO, INC.	50	0=0	5262001							A04450	***	0.400	04.404	***
24 0441041040		250			Х					\$24,158	\$929	\$192	\$1,121	\$82,639
34. CHURUBUSCO	50	4704	5292003	V					V	#00 000	#000	0400	#750	# 00.00 7
05. DEEL 0./// L.E.	PH,I	1781		X					Х	\$28,083	\$630	\$128	\$758	\$83,397
35. REELSVILLE	50	4050	5267006			V	V		V	#04.0F0	#4.005	0.475	#5.400	# 00 407
36. CLINTON TOWNSHIP	50	1950	DW100166 01 5283003		X	Х	Х		X	\$31,250	\$4,625	\$475	\$5,100	\$88,497
36. CLINTON TOWNSHIP	50	2000	5283003 DW100150 01	V	V	V			V	₽00.400	#2.000	#050	#0.050	CO4 747
37. NORTH LAWRENCE	50	2900	5247004	X	Х	Х			Х	\$29,100	\$3,000	\$250	\$3,250	\$91,747
37. NORTH LAWRENCE	50	16924		X	Х				Х	\$28,627	\$3,558	\$534	\$4,092	¢05 930
38. LAGRO	45	10924	DW101106 01		^				^	\$20,027	\$3,336	Ф034	\$4,092	\$95,839
30. LAGRU	45	496	DW102212 01						Х	\$23,235	\$475	\$165	\$640	¢06 470
39. FOWLER	45	496	5204006						^	ֆ∠3,∠35	\$475	\$105	φ040	\$96,479
39. FUWLER	45	2333			v	Х				\$25.750	\$767	\$193	\$960	¢07.420
40. SHARPSVILLE	35	∠333	וון פון הפוזאים		Х	^				\$∠5,750	\$161	φ193	\$900	\$97,439
40. GITARFSVILLE	ı	640	DW102214 01		Х	Х			Х	\$39,712	\$1,000	\$125	\$1,125	\$98,564
41. PITTSBORO	35	618	5232019		^	^			^	\$39,71Z	\$1,000	⊅ 125	Ф1,125	Ф90,004
41. FII I 3BUKU	35	1588			Х		Х			\$30,800	\$475	\$140	\$615	\$99,179
42. WINFIELD	30	1300	N/A		^		^			\$30,800	φ4/5	φ14U	φυισ	φ99, 179
42. VVINFIELD	30	C A E	DW102201 01		Х		Х			\$31,000	\$1,386	\$232	\$1,618	\$100 7 07
		645	DVV 102201 01		^	l	^			Φ31,000	\$1,386	⊅∠ 3∠	\$1,018	\$100,797

PPL Rank/Project Name	Total Score/ Project Need	Population Served	PWS ID#/ LOAN NO.	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>F</u>	MHI (Real \$\$)		Planning/ Design \$\$	<u>Total</u> <u>Project</u>	Cumulative Total
43. LAPORTE	30		5246017											
	I	21507	DW199131 01	X	X		X		X	\$25,021	\$750	\$100	\$850	\$101,647
44. GOSHEN	30		5220009											
	I	24950	DW101190 01	X	X				X	\$36,500	\$3,340	\$450	\$3,790	\$105,437
45. DARLINGTON	25		5254003											
	1	854	DW102205 01		X					\$38,831	\$180	\$25	\$205	\$105,642
46. SW BARTHOLOMEW	25													
	I	6500	DW102213 01	X	X					\$37,866	\$1,240	\$85	\$1,325	\$106,967
47. NEW HAVEN	25													
	I	12406	DW102215 01		Χ					\$33,868	\$4,000	\$500	\$4,500	\$111,467

Italics = Population <10,000 Lower Case = Have opted out

Bold = applied for SRF before April 2, 2001

highlighted = closed

Project Need

PH = Public Health, MCL Violation C = Compliance with SDWA I = Infrastructure type project A = Treatment Plant Installation or Upgrade of Existing System

B = Transmission/Distribution Line Project

C = Water Storage Project

D = Physical Consolidation Project

E = System Restructuring/Capacity Development

F = Other

MHI = Median Household Income

If two or more projects score equally under the Project Scoring and Ranking System, the project with the highest points in the Public Health Section will prevail. If a tie persists, then the project that serves the smallest population will prevail.

Projects Not Yet Scored:

BLOOMINGTON #1											
	100000	DW102208 01					\$35,366]	
BLOOMINGTON #2											
	100000	DW102209 01					\$35,366			1	•
MORGANTOWN											
	978	DW102216 01	X	X		X	\$21,806	\$585	\$156	\$741	

Dune Acres is now shown since they have not yet decided what their project will entail, and therefore, have not been scored.

SFY 2002 Applicants who dropped from the program:

		<u> </u>										
South Lawrence	90		5247007								l	
	1	6970	DW101191 01	X	X		X	\$25,605	\$5,258	\$511	\$5,769	